

Modern Militiaman

Issue #2, July-August, 1996

A Journal of the Modern Resistance Movement

Purpose and Dedication: This electronic and limited print newsletter is dedicated to the modern militiamen and women of the American Resistance Movement. The writers, editors, and contributors of this newsletter have by their talents become leading actors within the overall Patriot movement, be they militiamen, common-law jurists, tax-protesters, Freemen, shortwave talk-show hosts, Libertarians, Conspiracy Theorists or other assorted Rebels with a cause. We are an unruly bunch.

Most of the feeds and articles to this newsletter come off the Internet or electronic mail, which is the Gutenberg device of choice. Far-flung, quick, cheap, and secure, the Internet is a growing web of information which cannot be stopped or effectively censored. While at least one copy of each issue will be printed in order to take advantage of 1st Amendment press protections, thus blanketing the electronic edition, this and every issue is designed to be pulled apart and redesigned for every region, for every portion of the former Sweet Land of Liberty, to be used by Patriots everywhere. The opinions expressed in this newsletter are the opinions only of the authors, nobody else. The result should be freedom, not peace.

This is the first issue. I have the honor to be the first editor of it. Hopefully, there will be other issues, other editors, and new writers as the old ones are locked up, shot, run-off, Arkancided, or bored to death -- anything other than complacent. Now let's go out and raise some hell and have some fun.

Editor Martin Lindstedt

Copyright 1996. Anyone is at liberty to copy this newsletter in whole or in part for non-profit purposes provided they properly attribute copied portions to Modern Militiaman and the author(s). People who do make a buck from it are expected to pony up.

Table of Contents:

- [1. About This Issue](#) -- Patricia Neill, Roving Editor
 - [2. Infiltration by Government Agents](#) -- Mike Johnson
 - [3. Private Prosecutions](#) -- Jon Roland
 - [4. The Sense of History](#) -- Jane G. Beckman
 - [5. The Great Militia](#) -- Dave Delany
 - [6. They Say, I Say: Terrorism Debate](#) -- Patricia Neill
 - [7. Hacking the Politicians](#) -- J. Orlin Grabbe
 - 8. Martin Lindstedt: [Always Use a Tool Which Works or The Myth of Non-Violence](#)
 - 9. [Joe Z](#)
-

About This Issue:

As the roving editor of the second issue of this seditious rag, the *Modern Militiaman*, I would like to explain my concept for this issue. The information presented here, for the most part, is meant to be used tactically. We don't need to keep preaching to the choir, though I am guilty of that myself. We need to act. But in order to act, we need to know practical things to do. In this issue are articles on spotting infiltrators from Mike Johnson (anyone got any news of that boy, btw?), some ideas for private prosecutions by Jon Roland (I hope these ideas will be developed further), militia background and history from Dave Delany's Freedom House, some fine advice on finding out things you might want to know about your politicians from Orlin J. Grabbe, and for our education and entertainment: a screed by me, an outstanding poem by Jane Beckman, and a debate between Martin Lindstedt and Joe Zychik on the issue of nonviolent civil disobedience (JZ) and the usefulness of violence as a tool (ML). Read and Enjoy.

[Patricia Neill](#), Roving Editor

How to Spot a Government Infiltrator

by Mike Johnson

Those who have been studying the stories released to the media these days about the arrests of various different people within the militia movement will doubtlessly have noted that government infiltrators are usually involved. This **should** make people nervous.

And rightly so. Our normal view of government is that the only people who should have to worry about what the government is up to are people who are breaking the law. As the vast majority of constitutional militia units are composed of people who are of good character and don't go around breaking the law to begin with, they might feel that they should have little to worry about from the government.

Unfortunately that does not seem to be the case. The government appears to be going all out to discredit the constitutional militia movement in this country. This effort on the part of the government does include the use of government agents to infiltrate militia units and cause as many problems, hate and discontent as they possibly can. In many instances, these government agents may not be readily apparent as to who and what they are. Some of these people may have had extensive experience in working undercover operations and may not make some of the more stupid mistakes.

There are a variety of different roles that such government operatives may play. The first is that they may simply act as a mole. They will do everything anybody else in the unit does, and do nothing at all to call undue attention to themselves. However, they will relay everything that goes on within the unit to their handlers. About the only indication a unit may have that they have been infiltrated by a mole may be that they can't seem to be able to keep anything a secret. This type of role is the most difficult for a unit to detect and deal with. Which is also possibly why most of the spy novels that get written deal with various different ways to smoke out moles. While I wouldn't suggest that anybody try a technique for which the only source of documentation is a work of fiction, it is an indication of just how obnoxious this type of agent could be to deal with.

Another role that a government agent might play may be that of a dissipator. A dissipator is one who tries to redirect the course and energy of a unit in ways which will cause it to accomplish nothing of any importance. They may also act so as to break a unit up by emphasizing differences, disagreements and personality clashes between unit members. Given that the people who are attracted to the constitutionalist militia movement usually tend to be strong willed and opinionated people to begin with, such an agent may find that his task is somewhat easier than it might be if he were working with other groups. Unit members should simply be encouraged not to take things personally, be aware that there will be honest differences of opinion between the members of the unit, and to be wary of somebody who does try to take everything personally, or set up cliques within the unit.

The final role which will be discussed is that of the agent provocateur. Such an agent infiltrates a unit and tries to get the members of the unit to actually commit crimes, or make it look like they are actually planning to commit

crimes. One should also bear in mind that a government agent is not going to be confined to operating within any one of the roles that have been discussed, and may likely mix and match as they feel best. However, the role that has received the highest profile in government operations these days is that of the agent provocateur. That is largely because the results of an operation conducted by an agent provocateur or two make for good propaganda when the media gets hold of it. The resultant publicity given to the arrests and the charges gets used to brand everybody in the entire movement as a criminal. The fact that the entire thing was set up by someone in the employ of the government isn't going to be mentioned at all by the mainstream media.

For those who haven't caught on by now, your antenna should start to quiver in the presence of any one, or especially a combination of the following behaviors/patterns demonstrated by a unit member:

- (1) Wants to make bombs.
- (2) Wants to get everybody else to make bombs.
- (3) Wants people to buy/store large quantities of substances which could be used for explosives manufacture.
- (4) Fanatic about obtaining fully automatic weapons, **without** benefit of Class III license.
- (5) No obvious means of support, especially if they have lots of money to throw around.
- (6) Auto license tag changed on an irregular basis.
- (7) Encourages people to plan/do **stupid** things (raid armories, blow up office buildings, etc.)
- (8) Some groups can get auto tags run. They should be especially suspicious of anybody whose auto tag turns up a complete blank when run. (9) In our case, the guy was absolutely paranoid about his car being out of either his sight or his "wife's" sight for even a trivial amount of time.
- (10) Person claims to have a military background that they do not have. One individual claimed to be former Special Forces, but was found to be ignorant of some of the things that he should have known when quizzed by people who **were** former Special Forces. Depending on the level of trust that the members of your group have with each other, it might be a good idea to request to see the DD-214s of anybody claiming to have a military background.
- (11) One of your members has taken effective action to expose or block activities of the police or government preventing the expansion of or preservation of government power to control people and/or invade the privacy of the people.
- (12) One of your members (a) has an FFL; or (b) is involved in selling at gun shows; or (c) Is involved in promoting gun shows.

Arguably the best way to deal with people who meet criteria 1-10 is simply to invite them to leave the unit. As Starr and McCranie found out, trying to turn them in will do no good at all, so the next best bet is to try to get them to leave. Failing that, disband unit, start again from scratch with people you can trust after sufficient elapsed time. Given the way things are going right now, those who have not joined up with public units may want to consider forming small closed units with just a small group of people that they have known for a long time and that they trust.

For persons in 11, and 12: Do your best to be sure the goons cannot find a pretext as that is what they often work from.

(*) Bill Albert of the Michigan Militia contributed to the list of items to look for and the discussion which follows it.

Private Prosecutions

by Jon Roland

Although almost all criminal prosecutions today are conducted by public prosecutors, there is a longstanding tradition of Anglo-American law for criminal prosecutions to be conducted by private attorneys or even by

laymen. The forms of criminal procedure are the same for both kinds of prosecution, and they differ only in the official status and source of compensation of the prosecutor.

Most of the cases of private prosecution that we find in the federal courts were conducted by private attorneys who also represented the victim in a civil action against the accused.

The first of these federal cases of interest was *State of New Jersey v. William Kinder*, 701 F.Supp. 486 (D.N.J.1988). A private complainant instituted a criminal case against the defendant by charging him with simple assault and battery under the authority of New Jersey Municipal Court Rule 7:4-4(b), which provides in part, "any attorney may appear on behalf of any complaining witness and prosecute the action on behalf of the state or the municipality". After removing the case from the Municipal Court of New Brunswick, the defendant moved to dismiss. The District Court, Debevoise, J., held that: (1) Municipal Court Rule 7:4-4(b) allowing state to prosecute defendant through use of private attorney was applicable even upon removal to federal court, and (2) the private attorney who prosecuted the case did not have a conflict of interest that violated defendant's constitutional right to due process. In its opinion the Court stated that "there is no provision of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which conflicts with its provisions".

State courts which have invalidated criminal prosecutions by private attorneys have done so in cases involving serious crimes and those involving situations where a public prosecutor has expressly refused to prosecute the defendant. See e.g., *State v. Harton*, 163 Ga.App. 773, 296 S.E.2nd 112 (1982) (prohibiting private prosecution for vehicular homicide absent consent and oversight of the district attorney); *State ex rel. Wild v. Otis*, 257 N.W.2nd 361 (Minn.1977), appeal dismissed, 434 U.S. 1003, 98 S.Ct. 707, 54 L.Ed.2nd 746 (1978) (where county attorney refused to prosecute and grand jury refused to indict on charges of perjury, conspiracy, and corruptly influencing a legislator, private citizen could not prosecute and maintain such charges; dicta suggesting that this might be permissible with legislative approval and court appointed private attorney as prosecutor); see also, *Commonwealth v. Eisemann*, 308 Pa.Super. 16, 453 A.2nd 1045 (1982) (Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure require that a person who is not a police officer must get the district attorney's approval to file felony or misdemeanor charges which do not involve a clear and present danger to the community); *People ex rel. Luceno v. Cuzzo*, 97 Misc.2nd 871, 412 N.Y.S.2nd 748 (City Court, White Plains 1978) ("exercising its discretion," court prohibits private criminal prosecution against police officer where complainant was charged with a criminal offense arising out of the same occurrence).

The practice of using private attorneys to prosecute criminal offenses is derived from English common law. Until the late nineteenth century English criminal procedure relied heavily on a system of private prosecution even for serious offenses. This is discussed in some detail in a classic article by Morris Ploscowe, "The Development of Present-Day Criminal Procedures in Europe and America", 48 Harv.L.Rev. 433 (1935). On p. 437, Ploscowe states, "The Germanic procedure of Charlemagne and the Anglo-Saxon procedure of nearly the same period still looked upon the redress of most crimes as a private matter. ... Since crime was in general treated as a private injury, there was no distinction between civil and criminal proceedings." On p. 469, "The English criminal procedure developed its traditional accusatory characteristics largely because it relied upon a system of private prosecution. ... In the course of the 19th century private prosecution proved itself inadequate.

The private individual would frequently forego prosecution rather than incur the expense and responsibility involved. Sometimes there was no individual who could be called upon to prosecute a particular case, and when a private individual did institute proceedings, the case was very often badly prepared. Moreover, the system was abused for private ends, lending itself to bribery and collusion. ... The office of the Director of Public Prosecutions was created by act of Parliament in 1879.... Many towns and boroughs appoint solicitors whose functions are to prosecute offenders. ... Prosecutions are also carried on by the police, either directly or through private solicitors whom they hire. The traditional English system of private prosecution is therefore supplemented by various devices for public intervention. ... The public prosecutor has no greater advantages than any private solicitor or barrister prosecuting a case on behalf of a client."

Another case was *Wesley Irven Jones, Appellant, v. Jerry E. Richards, Sheriff of Burke County, N.C.*; Rufus L. Edmisten, Attorney General, State of North Carolina, Appellees, 776 F.2d 1244 (4th Cir.1985). On an appeal of a petition for habeas corpus denied, Circuit Judge Chapman held that no constitutional right was impaired by

involvement of the same attorneys as prosecutors in a criminal trial and as plaintiff's attorneys in civil suits filed against petitioner arising out of a traffic accident which produced both criminal charges and civil actions.

In their appeal, attorneys for petitioner cited *Ganger v. Peyton*, 379 F.2d 709 (4th Cir.1967), in which private prosecution was disallowed. However, in that case, the Commonwealth's attorney who prosecuted Ganger in his criminal case for an assault against his wife was at the same time representing Ganger's wife in a divorce proceeding. Ganger testified that the prosecuting attorney offered to drop the assault charge if Ganger would make a favorable property settlement in the divorce action. On the basis of that testimony, it was decided that Ganger's prosecutor "was not in a position to exercise fair-minded judgement" in the conduct of the case.

In North Carolina the use of private attorneys to assist the state in the prosecution of criminal cases "has existed in our courts from their incipency," *State v. Best*, 280 N.C. 413, 186 S.E.2d 1, 3 (1972), and such use in a particular case is committed to the discretion of a trial judge. *State v. Lippard*, 223 N.C. 167, 25 S.E.2d 594, 599, cert. denied, 320 U.S. 749, 64 S.Ct 52, 88 L.Ed. 445 (1943). However, when private attorneys are employed, the district attorney must remain in charge of and be responsible for the prosecution, *State v. Page*, 22 N.C.App. 435, 206 S.E.2d 771, 772 cert. denied, 285 N.C. 763, 209 S.E.2d 287 (1974).

Other states provide for private prosecutors by statute. In Texas, Vernon's Ann.Texas C.C.P. art. 2.07(a) [Attorney pro tem] provides that "Whenever an attorney for the state is disqualified to act in any case or proceeding, is absent from the county or district, or is otherwise unable to perform the duties of his office, or in any instance where there is no attorney for the state, the judge of the court in which he represents the state may appoint any competent attorney to perform the duties of the office during the absence or disqualification of the attorney for the state." However, by Op.Atty.Gen. 1990, JM-925, a district judge is authorized to appoint a district attorney pro tem pursuant to the above article even though there is an assistant district attorney in place. In *Davis v. State* (App. 12 Dist.1992) 840 S.W.2d 480 it was held that appointment of a special prosecutor was within the discretion of trial courts, and that such appointment is not predicated on the absence or disqualification of elected district attorney.

Visit [Jon's Web site](http://www.constitution.org/) at <http://www.constitution.org/>

A Sense of History

by Jane G. Beckman,

It is not conspiracy, but only realization---
History swinging its pendulum,
Replaying old fears and ancient ways.

Whither our world? Down routes we have gone
A thousand times before,
Even in the land of the Free.

I have been there, when Cary Chapman Catt sounded the call,
Or the agents of Pinkerton beat the strikers senseless,
Gone to jail with Woodhull and Sanger.
I remember COINTELPRO, and wars created for the sake of News.
They have lynched me in the South, and beaten me on marches.
I have shared a podium with Anthony and Fanny Wright,
Made impassioned pleas with the Sisters Grimke.

There is a black list, and a man named McCarthy,
And a man named J. Edgar who keeps a list of his enemies.

Houses have burned, and offices of newspapers,
Men jailed for speaking forbidden Truth.

This is America, but it has never been the Land of the Free,
But rather the Land of Opportunity, where the scrabblings of a few
Can raise them to rule over us.
To some, liberty or justice has ever been but a word.

Tell of Freedom to the railbaron, the magnates in patent-leather,
The oilmen and the usurers, the politicians and the police.
And of "protection" and payoffs, of people of no consequence,
Of crushing taxes, of oppressive factories, of company stores.
This, too, is the history of Our Land.

There is no more child labor, but it could come again.
Women are equals? Tell another story of utopias!
The soldier and the policeman are your friends?
It depends on where one stands in the scheme of things.
The lawyer and the politician, are they friend or foe?
Do they fight for ideals, or for personal gain?

Mr. Jefferson, how right you were, speaking of raided coffers,
And the way history might swing and sway, right and left.
Radicals and revolutionaries have ever given blood and bone,
Dear-bought the rights, the lives we lead,
That we might cast them to the winds, uncaring.

Such is the way of things, when man grows sleepy, sated,
When he forgets the terror of a knocking at the door.
And yet he wakes, and wakes to fight again,
Against an ancient spectre of injustice.

Perhaps it was Spartacus, or O'Connell, or Thomas Payne.
Perhaps it was a Martin Luther King, or Lech Walesa,
Or the shoutings of mobs in St. Petersburg or Paris,
Those crushed by tanks in Tienamin Square.

We look to heros of legend, name William Tell and Robin Hood,
Add our own names to Magna Carta or beneath John Hancocks,
Thinking we, too, might bear such company, never thinking price.
For there are expenses to be borne in bold acts,
And life and fortune are such little things to pay.

These are the currents of history,
Lifting frail banners of Freedom aloft.
They ebb and flow like tides,
And when the tide flows out,
There are bodies in the rockweed.

The Great Militia

by Dave Delany

The militia is a "grass roots" tool of the people, designed to check the abuse of its own internal government, *and* to defend against the incursions of a foreign enemy. The struggles of war are best left to an army which is to be called up *only* in the event of war -- "called up," not "impressed." Standing armies have no place on American soil. The professional soldier is without purpose in a free society. He is, as John Hancock clearly pointed out, sometimes a man unfit to live in society; a man who has no liberty, and despises it in others; a man who, for an extra penny in his paycheck, would gladly alter his allegiance.

We have seen the "professional" doing his work on our citizens, and preparing for assault in our cities. Besides the assaults at Waco and Ruby Ridge, we have all read the accounts of soldiers training in our cities. It must be clear from the beginning that the fine young men of our history, and the outstanding officers who have been called up during our conflicts with foreign nations, have been the finest, noblest, best disciplined in the history of the world's defense of freedom. We are now at odds with our history. Standing armies are training to obey the word to act against the neighbors of their youth. Standing armies *have no place* on American soil!

"But," answers Hancock against the obvious question, "since standing armies are so hurtful to a state, perhaps my countrymen may demand some substitute, some other means of rendering us secure against the incursions of a foreign enemy."

Our military strength should be increased, and our military budget should be slashed. Our defense should be trebled, and our professional soldiers cut by thirds thrice. We should be prepared to take on the world, and not venture from our shores to do so.

Hancock continues: "But can you be one moment at a loss? Will not a well disciplined militia afford you ample security against foreign foes? We want not courage; it is discipline alone in which we are exceeded by the most formidable troops that ever trod the earth." *That*, my friends, is why *you* are necessary in the militia; and by reason, by intuition, and by God, you *are* in the militia!

The militia is not a few groups of local organization. That is unnatural. You cannot call up the militia of Maine to defend your California home, and when the force directed against you is the army of the federal government, or one of its fingers, you can hardly call upon the hand of the federal government to protect you! Do you somehow think that the commander in chief is immune from the abuse of power? Rather than replacing the local militia, the growth of the federal army requires the increase in the strength of the local militia. The local militia is the only defense against the tyranny of a standing army.

Josiah Quincy wrote in 1774, that standing armies are composed of men "whose interest and very existence, depend on an abuse of their power." Do you understand? Is that clear? "Booty and blind submission is the science of the camp."

The solution? Quincy sounds much like Hancock: "No free government was ever founded or ever preserved its liberty without uniting the characters of the citizen and the soldier in those destined for the defense of the state. The sword should never be in the hands of any, but those who have an interest in the safety of the community, who fight for their religion and their offspring; -- and repel invaders that they may return to their private affairs, and the enjoyment of freedom and good order. Such are a well regulated militia composed of the freeholders, citizen and husbandman, who take up arms to preserve their property as individuals, and their rights as freemen."

"A well regulated militia:" a standing army? God forbid! They are naturally at odds with one another! Joseph Warren spoke passionately against the professional soldier among the people. A great statesman, he saw that the professional soldiery are "taught to consider arms as the only arbiters by which every dispute is to be decided between contending states; -- they are instructed implicitly to obey their commanders, without enquiring into the justice of the cause they are engaged to support; hence it is, that they are ever to be dreaded as the ready engines of tyranny and oppression. And it is too observable that they are prone to introduce the same mode of decision in the disputes of individuals, and from thence have often arisen great animosities between them and the inhabitants, who, whilst in a naked, defenseless state, are frequently insulted and abused by an armed soldiery."

Quincy: "An invasion and conquest by mere strangers and foreigners are neither so formidable or disgraceful as the establishment of a standing army under color of the municipal law of the land."

Are you swept up by the current foment against the local militias? Forgive the brashness of the question, but . . . Are you stupid? I suspect not. You have probably assumed the best and most noble of our government.

Let me close by adding yet another figure from our nation's great and formative history, Benjamin Rush. He said, in 1787: "the American war is over, but this is far from being the case with the American revolution. On the contrary, nothing but the first act of the drama is closed." He was speaking then of the weakness of our nation. I am writing now of the weakness of our nation also. "Hear her proclaiming, in sighs and groans, in her governments, in her finances, in her trade, in her manufactures, in her morals and in her manners," (do you hear them?) "The Revolution is not over." If we are to remain free, it never will be. God bless the militia.

Dave Delany's Freedom House
PO Box 212
Conklin NY 13748

For the real thing, send a donation! Get the graphics, the contributing writers, and the proper formatting! \$20 suggested for one year.

For an on line subscription, [send the message](#) "subscribe" freedomh@spectra.net.

Copyright: Dave Delany's Freedom House You may copy and repost this material for non-commercial use, if the articles remain intact and credit is given to Dave Delany's Freedom House

They Say, I Say: Terrorism Debate

by Patricia Neill

So the national media and my governors sez to me "Hey Patty. You are not safe. Life is not secure. There are terrorists loose in the land. We're gonna take your freedoms, all of 'em, and we'll make you safe and secure."

So I sez to them: "Precisely how safe are you gonna make me, pal? You had thousands of cops, security guards, tons of FBI, ATF, GBI, an entire stew of security guys, surveillance cameras, all kinds of that security junk at the Olympics and *still* you couldn't stop what happened. People get hurt and killed with your security, you assholes. What security? I ain't buying, no thanks no way."

Sez They: "But planes are falling out of the sky, terrorists are blowing up planes!! We need to really buckle down and get these terrorists, and yeah, we're gonna take away your right to travel, we're gonna stick a chip in your body so we can track your every movement in case you get kidnapped or something, and we're gonna limit everything you can do and say, but you'll have security! You'll be safe!"

Sez Me: "You guys are a pack of liars! You tell me in New York State that I cannot carry a gun to protect myself with if I am attacked. And yet you also tell me that is not the job of the police to protect me, just as you told that woman in New York and you didn't allow her to buy a gun and she was attacked and nearly killed by her exboyfriend. She sued your asses, and then the court had the unmitigated gall to tell her that the police are not obligated to protect citizens and can't be sued for not doing so. YOU ARE LIARS. You are not offering me security you stupid bozos, this is a naked power grab on your part and you know it. You people are really ignorant if you think we're gonna buy this one. I'll tell you what, you lying media whores and you lying politician whores, I am going to protect myself. And I am going to defend my country from the likes of you nazis."

Sez They: "Help, help, this woman is obviously a hate mongering extremist terrorist. Help Help! We'll have to listen in on all your conversations and watch you with our surveillance cameras. We must arrest her immediately and put her away where she cannot harm society. Help Help!"

Sez Me: "I may be a hate mongering extremist, for I hate your lies and your brazen and obvious power grabs. I hate the way you are selling my country and my rights down the river, you traitorous bastards. You are traitors to this country, you are nazis, National Socialists, each and every one of you. Damn straight I hate your actions. As for mongering, no one is paying me for these opinions (damn it). As for extremist, you are right on the money there. I am no conforming, braindead consumer. I am a wide-awake, thinking American and ***I* *don't* *like* *you* *guys.*** Oh and by the way, I have no intention of harming society, but I do intend to put you traitors out of business, so just get used to the thought."

Sez They: "Help Help! This woman is no doubt a member of one of those terrorist militias. Help Help."

Sez Me: "Well, technically, the law says males between the ages of 17 and 45, so I'm the wrong sex and I'm almost too old, but the hell with that. You're damn tooting I'm a militiamember, you lowlife creeps. It is an AMERICAN thing to be. I intend to defend my Free State from the likes of you betrayers of the people, from the traitors we find in all political offices, from your lying propagandists, the media."

Sez They: "But those militia members in Georgia had bombs! They had discussed blowing up the Olympics! The militias are all terrorists!"

Sez Me: "Lying will get you no where, pal. Your lies are becoming very obvious, in case you weren't aware of that fact. Your very own ATF agents fed that Olympics story to the media, who of course, bought that lie hook line and sinker as they always do from their "bosses." And your very own ATF agent admitted under oath that he had planted those bomb parts on the guy's property without his knowledge! Your very own ATF agent admitted to doing all of this, under oath, on the stand in a courtroom. The ATF are terrorists. And besides that they're NAZIS!"

Sez They: "We're going to get you! We have all the power on our side."

Sez Me: "Oh yeah? Go talk to King George the III."

"Political rights do not originate in parliaments, they are rather forced upon them from without .They do not exist because they have been legally set down on a piece of paper, but only when they have become the ingrown habit of a people and when any attempt to impair them will meet with the violent resistance of the populace."
Rudolf Rocker

Hackers vs. Politicians

by J. Orlin Grabbe

Politicians are those annoying people who--drink in hand--can stare at a unencoded file for hours, fall into a sexual reverie involving ASCII entities, and then weave their way to the nearest TV camera to pontificate about pornography on the Internet.

But, you ask, if they are so dumb, why are they so rich? Sometimes the latter **is** a mystery, reminiscent of the miracle of the loaves and the fishes.

Take the case of a man who can hardly pay his bills, but who gets elected to national political office and goes off to Washington for a few years. Then--lo and behold!--on his simple politician's salary, he suddenly manages to maintain two fine homes, one inside the beltway in Chevy Chase and another in his home town community of

Rat's Ass, to purchase new cars for his wife and himself, to accumulate lakefront property in a neighboring county, and to stash away a nice sum of cash in a foreign bank account.

If the "simple politician's salary" bit sounds improbable, it probably is. Let's face it: many politicians are on the take. They may have hidden sources of income involving illegal payoffs from corporations, lobbying groups, or individuals. Are you a student? Then you will be proud to know that educational commissions and associations are also a hot new conduit for political bribes.

This article suggests a few basic procedures for finding out whether that special politician you have in mind is getting more on the side than ASCII sex. Honest politicians, of course, will have nothing to fear from any of the following.

Is what I am about to do legal? you ask. Of course it is. To reassure yourself, pull out your world-wide web browser and take a peak at one of the many data service companies, say Insights, Inc. (located at <http://isis.iah.com/insights/background/>). They promise, using only an individual or business name and/or address, to provide sufficient information for:

Preparing Due Diligence Reports
Locating People or Businesses
Exposing and Controlling Fraud
Uncovering & Verifying Background Information
Identifying and Verifying Assets

How do they get away with this? Simple. They legally search public records. Much of this public-record information is computerized, although some of it is not. In any event, I do not advocate illegal or questionable access methods, or the breaking of any laws. Checking up on the (possibly criminal) politician of your choice doesn't have to be a crime.

Still not convinced? Hop over to <http://www.infi.net/~dgs.assc/locator/bgrndnfo.html> Infonet (<http://www.infi.net/~dgs.assc/locator/bgrndnfo.html>), which for a fee will mine public records for nuggets like:

Felony and Misdemeanor Criminal Filings --"Search any court in the nation for a seven year history of criminal filings and possible convictions." (Many politicians wait until they reach office to work on this part of their resume, but some are early starters.)

Driving Histories--"Search a three to seven year history of an individuals driving performance, including tickets and accidents." (So you don't really care if your politician speeds a little now and then. But, on the other hand, did that official who helped him get out of a DWI expect a quid pro quo?)

Upper and Lower Court Civil Filings--"Obtain a civil litigation history of any individual in any court in the United States." (Is there some hidden reason this guy is getting sued all the time?)

Social Security Number Tracking--"Access all three credit bureaus to verify the user of a social security number and the addresses being used." (Having your politician's social security number is the next best thing to having his Swiss bank account number.)

Professional Licensing--"Verify the existence and status of an entity's license in a specific practice area, such as private investigation, medicine, real estate and more." (Was your politician really a world-renowned physicist before returning home to run for mayor of Rat's Ass?)

Consumer and Business Credit Reports--"Review account balances, credit terms and payment histories for an individual or business." ("So, before he went to Washington, he couldn't pay his bills . . .")

Well, if they can do it, so can you.

So where do you start? Well, first see what the politician him/herself has to say about the money flows. Federal law (5 USC app. 6, section 101 et seq.) requires members of Congress to file *Financial Disclosure Statements* yearly. The Financial Disclosure form has nine parts:

Schedule I: Earned Income

Schedule II: Payments in Lieu of Honoraria Made to Charity

Schedule III: Assets and "Unearned Income"

Schedule IV: Transactions.

Schedule V: Liabilities

Schedule VI: Gifts

Schedule VII: Fact-Finding, Substantial Participation, and Other Travel

Schedule VIII: Positions

Schedule IX: Agreements

Want to see Newt Gingrich's personal finances for the year 1993? Direct your web browser to <http://www.cais.com/newtwatch/93sei.html>.

Many state, county, and city elections have similar requirements, either on a personal or a campaign basis. Want to see a copy of the *Candidate Campaign Statement-Long Form-Form 490* for Joel Ventresca, candidate for Mayor of San Francisco? Visit Campaign Net at <http://tmx.com/sfvote>.

These statements represent what a politician says he or she has or gets. But the really interesting items--like those kickbacks from the Cali cartel--not surprisingly go unreported. To get the good stuff, you will need your full hacker armor.

The first thing to get is your politician's *social security number (SSN)*. It's not difficult. Your politician loves to be photographed doing his/her civic duty of voting. Which means he or she fills out a *voter's registration card* (public information) which will contain said politician's name, address, date of birth, party affiliation, and--usually--social security number. Voter files may be obtained at your politician's local county court house, as well as on many on-line data bases. A person's SSN is the common key that links together many commercial and government data bases.

Can't find the SSN number on the voter's registration card? Then try *DMV* records. The insurance lobby has made sure that driver's records are easy to get, along with the details of any accidents, and critical driver information such as height, color of eyes, address--and social security number, if the latter was required information on the form. (California won't give out addresses, if a request has been filed not to do so--the "movie star" exemption.) In about 20 states the individual's social security number is the driver's license number.

Still searching? Then go with the triple whammy of the major credit bureaus--TRW, TransUnion, and CBI/Equifax.

The Fair Credit Reporting Act essentially implies you must be contemplating a business relationship--such as selling a car, renting an apartment, giving a loan, or attempting to collect on a judgment--with a party to request his credit report. But the *header* information in the file--such as social security number, date of birth, address, and spouse's name--is legally available to anyone, and your inquiry (unlike an actual credit report) will leave no footprints. The addresses and phone numbers are:

TRW

660 N. Central Expressway, Exit 28

Allen, TX 75002

Automated phone: 800-392-1122

Phone: 800-422-4879

CBI/Equifax

5505 Peachtree Dunwoody, #600

Atlanta, GA 30374-0241.
Automated phone: 800-685-1111
Phone: 800-685-5000

Trans Union
P.O.Box 7000
North Olmsted OH 44070-7000
Automated phone: 800-851-2674
Phone: (714) 738-3800, ext. 6450

Are you a hacker-journalist? Then take a peak at the National Institute for Computer-Assisted Reporting (NICAR; located at <http://www.nicar.org/>). Their bylaws prohibit them from selling data to nonjournalists (not that you want to *buy* data anyway--we're just exploring *possibilities*). But data is "sold at or below costs to journalism organizations or individuals for legitimate journalism uses only." (Doing your civic duty to keep tabs on your politician is, naturally, a legitimate journalistic use of the data.) Their data bases include these publicly-available information sets, among others:

Organization: Government Services Agency
Databases: Federal Procurement Contracts for 1992-1994.

Organization: Federal Election Commission
Databases: Campaign Contributions for the 1991-1994 election cycle.

Organization: Federal Reserve Board
Databases: home mortgage loans covered by Home Mortgage

Disclosure Act (for 1992-1994)

Organization: Federal Aviation Administration Databases: Service Difficulty Reports, Airman Directory, Aircraft Registry

Organization: Federal Bureau of Investigation
Databases: Uniform Crime Reports

Organization: Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms
Databases: Gun Dealer Licenses

The existence of such data immediately brings to mind a barrage of possibly relevant questions:

Is there an incestuous relationship between the donors to your politician's campaign and subsequent federal government contracts? (It always starts somewhere . . .) To find out, compare federal procurement data with campaign contributions. Campaign contribution data from the Federal Election Commission are supposed to include all contributions by individuals and political action groups (PACs) to a politician's federal election campaign. The Government Services Agency, meanwhile, keeps Individual Contract Action Reports (ICARs), which has information about the federal agency granting a government contract, the identity of the contractor, and the contract dollar amount.

Has your politician recently purchased a new home? What is its value? What was the down payment? Is he or she living suspiciously beyond his or her means? What is your politician's race or gender (DNA sequence)? To start to answer these questions, look at home mortgage data. The Federal Reserve Board started keeping data like this in order to check on "fair" lending practices. So the Fed began tracking home and home-improvement loans, as well as bank-purchased loans. (And just to help the enterprising hacker, when your politician is buying, or possibly refinancing, a house, most banks will now ask for his Social Security Number on the Deed of Trust, especially as the Federal National Mortgage Association now requires it.)

Does your politician own an aircraft? What's its value? Did he purchase it with cash? Check the FAA's aircraft records.

Does your politician own a gun even while advocating gun control? If he bought the gun from a dealer, ATF records can help out here.

And so on.

Now let's get to the nitty-gritty: *city, county, and state records*. The *City Clerk* in your politician's home town will have a list of business licenses (name, address, date) and building permits (name, address, cost of construction). The *County Clerk* or *County Recorder* should have liens on file (lien holder, payment agreements), a Probate Index (estate settlements), records of lawsuits and judgments, powers of attorney with respect to real estate, records of mortgages on personal property, and bankruptcy papers. Here you can find out not only the value of your politician's property, but also the names, addresses, and property values of everyone who lives on his street. *City and County Courts* will also maintain a Civil Index (civil actions, plaintiffs and defendants, as well as civil files: description of any disputed property or valuables), a Criminal Index (criminal cases in Superior Court, as well as criminal files), and voter's registration files.

The *county tax collector* will have a description of any property owned, as well as taxes paid on real estate and personal property. The *county assessor* may also have maps and photos, or even blueprints showing the location of your politician's hot tub. The *Secretary of State* will have corporation files and possibly annual reports of your politician's company.

Okay, let's go over it again, taking it slow. With your politician's social security number in hand, you can get header information from the major credit bureaus. This will give you a seven to ten year history of addresses, as well any spousal name or names. The latter is very important, since your average politician's instinct will be to keep questionable sums of money and suspect personal assets in the name of his or her spouse, sibling, business associate, or girlfriend.

Next you go to the state Department of Motor Vehicles, to find out your politician's tastes in cars, trucks, motorcycles, boats, trailers, and recreational vehicles. Of course if your politician leases any of the above, he or she will not show up as the vehicle owner. So the next thing to do is to run the license plate number of that Caddy parked out front, since this will give you the name of both lessee and lessor.

Next you talk to someone who does business with your politician, and who thus has a permissible reason under the Fair Credit Reporting Act to run a credit check. This will give you a listing of all your politician's credit accounts, current balances, payment history, and payment terms. Any bankruptcies in the last ten years, or liens or judgments in the last seven years, will be listed. Did your politician suddenly receive a huge campaign contribution from some source, soon after your politician found himself stuck with a quarter million dollar judgment against him? If so, he won't be the first person who has sold out his country to pay off a personal financial debt.

What property does your politician own? The offices of County Recorder and County Tax Assessor will give you the land value, improvement value, and total assessed values for any property. They will frequently have also the amounts received for any sales, the sale dates, as well as information on the mortgage-holder or other lender. Did your politician get a large loan from Washoe International State Bank just about the time Washoe International State Bank was having trouble with state banking regulators, who are overseen by a legislative committee on which your politician sits?

Does your politician own a business of any consequential size? Then run a business credit check. Who are (were) your politician's business associates? Who are the company officers and principals? Or--if as is commonly the case--your politician is a lawyer, who are the law partners? Look also for bankruptcies, tax liens, public records filings, judgments, and UCC (Uniform Commercial Code) financing statements. These documents may turn out to be filled with all sorts of unexpected names, dates, and activities.

On what honorary commissions does your politician serve? Do the commission's audited financial statements show any payments for services not rendered? This was apparently what New York Attorney General Dennis Vacco was wondering, when he noted, on January 9, 1996, in a letter to the National Center on Education and the Economy: "Statement 11 on your 1990 Federal 990 and Note 5 on your 1990 audited financial statements indicate that the Center had retained the services of Hillary Rodham Clinton, a member of the Rose Law Firm, to direct your Workforce Skills Program while she also served as a member of the Center's Board of Trustees. Statement 11 of the 1990 filing indicates that Mrs. Clinton received \$23,000 for unspecified services. The 1990 filing also refers to a second contract, which was reported to be in the amount of \$150,000 covering the period February 1, 1991 through January 31, 1992, and a similar statement appears on Statement 11 attached to the 1991 Federal 990."

Moreover, did either Hillary Clinton or the Rose Law firm pay taxes on the sums received? (A little birdie tells me neither one did.)

The office of the Secretary of State in any of the 50 states can be a source of UCC searches. UCC Indices will show whether your politician is listed as either a debtor or secured party. (Okay. So your politician is up to his neck in debt to Jackson Stephens. That doesn't mean he listens to a word of political advice Stephens gives him. No way.)

Superior Courts, Federal Bankruptcy Courts, Small Claims Courts, and city, county, and state tax authorities keep records of tax liens, court judgments, and bankruptcy filings. These reveal not only outstanding financial obligations, but also personal and company affiliations, partners, subsidiaries, and dependents. (Is there a Don Lasater or Don Tyson in your politician's background?)

Does your politician really have those degrees he claims? Call the college registrar. Despite what you think, many politicians don't believe in their own "self-made man" rhetoric, and will enhance their resumes with unearned degrees. This in itself may only be a venal sin, but someone who records falsehoods in this area will likely also lie in others.

Has your politician been in the news? Check your library's newspaper file, along with reader's guides, and other news indexes. On the Internet, you can quickly search for your politician's name among the 8 billion words on 16 million WWW pages, using the new Alta Vista search utility created by Digital Equipment Corporation. You can also do a name or keyword search through all 13,000 Usenet groups. Alta Vista is located at <http://altavista.digital.com/>.

Be sure to read Lee Lapin's book *The Whole Spy Catalog*, (Intelligence Incorporated, 2228 S. El Camino Real, San Mateo, CA 94403; ISBN 1-880231-10-7) for literally dozens of names, addresses, and phone numbers of data information providers, along with an evaluation of their services. You don't need to patronize these services in order to steal ideas from them.

Basically none of these providers specializes in politicians, so after a little self-education and set-up, you may be in a position to start your own business in political investigations. Bill yourself as a 21st Century Sherlock Holmes. (*Somebody* has to stop the nefarious influence of DigiCrime, Inc., found at <http://www.digicrime.com/>.)

Oh. About those foreign bank accounts. Well, I'll leave that to your imagination. But a little birdie told me if you call a military base computer, find an out-dial number, call another military base, and so on, going through a *minimum* of three military bases, any trace back will stop at the third military base.

Whatever you do, don't do anything illegal.

Always Use a Tool Which Works

or

The Myth of Non-Violence

VIOLENCE, LIKE GUNS, IS A NEUTRAL TOOL USED BY GOOD AND EVIL MEN ALIKE to carry out their goals. Arguing about "good" violence as opposed to "bad" violence is an act of futility. Successful violence is defined as "good" by the victors while violence used by those who lose, be it for purposes of aggression or defense, whatever, is always defined as being "bad." That is simply the way it is. No amount of argument ever changes this fact, although it does try to disguise it.

Violence was used to form this country. George III just wouldn't step down from being king just because the Declaration of Independence asserted that the colonies had decided that they didn't consent to his further rule and he was now an illegitimate despot. Violence kept this country united when the South decided to go her own way. Violence maintains the current government. George Washington said that the essence of government was force. Force is useless unless it contains the threat of violence or fails to deliver upon that threat. And now that this country is decaying, the social order is falling apart, and no justice is to be found, expect a Golden Age of Violence to come about.

Count on it.

NON-VIOLENCE WOULD BE PREFERABLE. Sane people should be able to work out their differences without the need for bloodshed, express or implied. However, a policy of non-violence seldom, if ever, works.

The two times within this century when a supposed policy of "non-violence" worked were in Mohandas Gandhi's kicking the British out of India and the supposed triumph of Martin Luther King and desegregation. Neither policy was entirely successful and they only worked in their limited fashion because the following two prerequisites were present:

1.) The status quo is able to be reasoned with and retains some sense of decency.

Gandhi used his techniques against an English government which had promised to leave India if she helped England fight. While Gandhi was imprisoned a number of times by the British government, eventually Gandhi's demand that the Indians be master in their own house was met.

Let's say the Germans had won WWII and by conquest succeeded the English as rulers of India. Would there have been talk of non-violence if they had done with Hindus as they did with Jews? Of course not!

Now let's take Martin Luther King and his struggles with Southern whites for integration of the Negro into white society. Martin Luther King succeeded only because the early 1960's was a time when this country was willing to make some accommodation with allowing blacks to vote, desegregate educational facilities and public offices, and spend some political muscle into seeing that by dint of "interstate commerce" laws that private institutions were forced to integrate. The Southern political establishment and some of the white middle class were "soft" on the notion that it was time for the Negro to get some of his rights. They went along, although they complained aloud for public consumption.

One of the phrases in King's "I have a Dream" speech concerned how blacks had a "blank check" to cash in reparations due to white injustice against them. Such a phrase today would be laughed away today by rich and middle-class white Republicans tired of paying taxes for welfare programs. The time for such as Martin Luther King has long passed.

No, the South of the early and middle '60's was ripe for de jure Negro integration, as whites and blacks had been working and living close together for a hundred years and it was sensed that it was time to change the artificial, government-imposed conditions which held the blacks down. True integration proceeded farther and faster in the

South than it did in Northern cities. Martin Luther King tried to help out Northern city blacks but failed. Chicago was not interested because Chicago was not ready to listen.

2.) There is a credible threat of violence to back up the protestations of non-violence.

White Englishmen were outnumbered by thousands to one by Indians. They realized that if the Indians decided to rise up and kill them all, the English were toast. The English remembered the Great Mutiny of 1857 and recognized that unless nuclear weapons were used, ten thousand trigger-fingers to one were hopeless odds. In addition to being too tired to maintain their Empire, the English no longer had enough of a technological edge to maintain it in the face of open hostility from the natives.

Martin Luther King and his bunch of black "Reverends" were quite adept at using militants like Malcom X, Stokely Carmichael, and the Black Panthers to play games of "good nigger -- bad nigger" against rich, soft, white authorities in the South. "Unless there is social justice NOW, them 'bad niggers' will riot, burn down and loot your stores and rape white wimmin!"

(I hear the same thing today from white folks about what "them niggers" are going to do if welfare checks are stopped.)

While some of the poor rednecks and Ku Kluckers would have loved to fight a race war, the Southern white establishment had far more to lose, including positions of influence over white and black alike. In the South, the blacks lived cheek and jowl with whites. In the North, blacks lived in discernible ghettos or districts, and thus in case of racial war would be easier to contain. Southerners knew they were far more vulnerable, hence they had to come to some sort of accommodation.

So unless there are present in the current social situation the above two factors of open-minded decency on the part of the ruling status-quo and a credible threat of violence from the agitating change faction, any hope of accomplishing peaceful change through "civil disobedience" or "non-violent protest" is sheer fantasy. Idiotic, dangerous fantasy. Remember, violence is a tool, and tools are meant to be used.

IN FACT, VIOLENCE IS AT ITS MOST UNCONTROLLABLE whenever dishonorable people have a relative monopoly on violence and their victims believe in pacifism. Hence the slaughter of Jews by National Socialist Germans, wherein an orgy of bloodshed was engaged in by masochists and sadists feeding each other's sickness.

Violence is only able to understand Violence and usually only by methods of counting, be it the number of trigger-fingers aiming rifle barrels, or tanks, nuclear missiles, biological weapons, or whatever is the latest and greatest weapon of violence. The neutral tool of Violence has no good nature towards which to make moral appeal. Violence is only deterred by the presence of greater Violence.

So understanding these facts of life concerning both human nature and the uses of violence, for good people to eschew Violence merely assures that evil people will seek, then gain, an unobstructed monopoly on Violence. Once these evil people have a monopoly of violence they will use it to enslave more docile human beings and kill anyone who threatens to get in their way. This is the nature of government and it explains why slavery, in its many forms, always exists.

God himself will eventually have to use force, or the threat of it, in order to forever imprison Satan. In the ongoing struggle of good vs. evil, it will not be by means of gentle persuasion that evil desists, but through the use of force. All foolish pacifists wish to do is convince the credulous that they are better than God.

IT IS AN ITEM OF TACIT AGREEMENT among the natural leaders of the militia movement that eventually it will come down to violence. Some of us might file lawsuits or run for political office or pursue other "non-violent" means of change, even though we know there is no justice to be found in government courts and there is no chance to be elected in a society determined to cannibalize itself until there is nothing left to loot. Why do we engage in activity hopeless in its own right?

It is no longer so much a matter of de-legitimizing government. Most people realize the government is corrupt and unjust since the government was the greatest devourer of its former right to rule.

Right now we are in the middle of the choosing of sides for the Great Violence ahead. An array of the New Elite, with their allies of Constitutionals, Militant Libertarians, Birchers, home-schoolers, Radicalized Christians, Militias, Common-Law Sovereigns and other tired producers prepare to do battle with the tired, corrupt Old Elite and their rabble of government workers, army-of-occupation police thugs, politicians, lawyers, corporations, bankers, and other assorted parasitic looters. In between both camps are the great mass of Homer Simpsons, uneasily sitting on the fence, waiting for one side to win. The entire country holds its breath for the election of 1996, after which this country will implode when some trifling incident sparks a Second American Civil War.

Our side must present Justice- and Freedom-based alternatives to violence, if for no other reason than to increase the poignancy due to good-faith efforts shattered upon the greed-carapace of evil.

Right now, the very best and brightest militia people are beginning to measure the new foundations of government for after we win this war. Will we have a loose confederation of states banded together for mutual protection? Small republics of like-minded people? An overall Cromwellian military dictatorship for 40 years until the people are worthy to reassume a whole American Republic? Petty monarchies or despotism? Complete anarchy?

We will probably win this upcoming war, although some of us won't be around to celebrate the victory. Good usually triumphs over evil for no other reason than because good can survive on its own, but evil must live off of good. But what happens if all the good is completely destroyed because it did not use the tool of Violence? Granted, evil devours itself upon its lusts. How does this benefit good?

Non-violence is a mirage dreamed up by pacifists -- cowards demanding halos. Far better to use a tool which works.

[Martin Lindstedt](#), militiaman,
7th Missouri Militia
Libertarian Candidate for Governor

Check out [Patrick Henry On-Line](#), Your [One-Stop Shopping for Sedition](#).

And from Mr. Zychik, who could not participate due to a busy schedule:

Dear Patty,

I agreed to submit an article to you voicing my objections to the use of violence as a means of bringing about change in the US.

Due to a pressing work schedule and a misunderstanding about the terms of the debate, I will not be submitting the article.

Please accept my apologies for any inconvenience or delay I may have caused you.

Sincerely,

Joe Zychik
